



# City of Loma Linda Official Report

Floyd Petersen, Mayor  
Stan Brauer, Mayor pro tempore  
Robert Christman, Councilmember  
Robert Ziprick, Councilmember  
Charles Umeda, Councilmember

COUNCIL AGENDA: July 26, 2005  
TO: City Council  
VIA: Dennis R. Halloway, City Manager  
FROM: Pamela Byrnes-O'Camb, City Clerk  
SUBJECT: Minutes of April May 24, June 7, 14 and 28, 2005

## RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council approve the Minutes of May 24, June 7, 14, and 28, 2005.

Regular Meeting of May 24, 2005

A regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor Petersen at 5:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 24, 2005 in the Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:

Mayor Floyd Petersen  
Mayor pro tempore Stan Brauer  
Robert Christman  
Robert Ziprick  
Charles Umeda

Councilman Absent:

None

Others Present:

City Manager Dennis Halloway  
City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

**CC-2005-064 – Closed Session – Public Employee Evaluation (Government Code Section 549570)**

- a. City Manager
- b. City Attorney

The City Council immediately recessed to consider the closed session item as listed and reconvened at 6:11 p.m. with all members present. City Attorney Holdaway stated that there was no action to announce.

**CC-2005-065**

**CRA-2005-026 – Workshop with the Redevelopment Agency, Budget Committee, and Staff relating to the proposed 2005-2006 fiscal year budget**

The Redevelopment Agency convened and Mayor Petersen chaired the item. City Manager Halloway introduced the item, stating that a balanced budget was presented for consideration; the General Fund consisted of a maintenance budget in that no new projects or programs were proposed. He drew attention to the Redevelopment Agency and an aggressive spending plan to:

- 1) Underground utilities and install a median island with landscaping on Redlands Boulevard between Mountain View Avenue and Anderson Street;
- 2) Expand the Loma Linda Branch Library (efforts to obtain grant funding through State Bonds were unsuccessful)
- 3) Replace fire apparatus.

Replacement of water lines, valves and vehicles was also included in the proposed budget. The Connected Community Program was expanding with the second phase of construction along Beaumont Avenue.

Extensive discussion ensued relating to replacement of either a fire truck or engine. Fire Chief Norris stated that the engine was a 1993 model that was removed from service because parts were unavailable. A 1982 engine with 200,000 miles on it was placed in reserve status. Chief Norris elaborated that a smaller engine with a shorter wheelbase was being considered in order to access the newer communities with narrow streets and which would be versatile so that it could be used in the urban wild land interface areas as well. He clarified that current equipment consisted of one brush engine, one water tender, a truck company with ladder, one reserve engine, one front line engine, one rescue squad, and one medic squad.

In response to questions, Chief Norris indicated that the ladder truck, a 1986 model, also needed to be replaced in that it had been out of service for several months of the current year, and suggested its replacement be included in the 2006-2007 budget. The main problem with the ladder truck pertained to hydraulics for the ladder and platform. He also reviewed mutual aid, tools, and tactical uses of fire equipment.

Finance Director DeAnda presented an overview of the 2005-2006 fiscal year budget stating that relating to the General Fund:

- 1) It was anticipated the year would begin with \$4 million; \$2 million in the "rainy day fund" and \$100,000 in Capital Replacement Reserve.
- 2) Revenues and other resources would generate \$12.6 million. The top five revenues comprised 73% of the General Fund Budget: sales tax, refuse service charges, administrative charges to other funds, motor vehicle license fees, and property taxes.
- 3) Proposed expenditures were \$12.6 million: Administration \$4.3 million; Community Development, \$1 million; Public Safety, \$5.1 million; and Public Works, \$1.4 million.

She stated that the budget was balanced with a year-end balance of \$4 million, with \$2 million in the "rainy day reserve" and a proposal to increase the Capital Equipment Reserve by \$50,000.

She reviewed State Budget impacts, noting that this was the second year of revenue take-away known as ERAF 3 wherein the State takes from the City's secured property tax.

Ms. DeAnda then stated that for the City as a whole, the proposed beginning balance was \$16 million; revenues and other resources of \$41.4 million, including the General Fund of \$12.6 million; Sewer, \$2.6 million; Loma Linda Connected Community, \$3.4 million; Water Funds, \$3.9 million; Federal and State Grants, \$5.2 million; Capital Fund of \$2.8 million and other special funds of \$4.4 million.

Proposed expenditures amounted to \$42 million: General Fund, \$12.6 million; Sewer Fund, \$3 million; Loma Linda Connected Communities, \$1.7 million; Water Fund, \$6.5 million; Federal/State Construction Fund, \$4.9 million; Capital Fund, \$2.8 million and other special funds \$2.7 million. The ending balance was proposed to be \$15.4 million.

She reviewed the Redevelopment Agency, stating that the starting balance was proposed to be \$6.9 million; estimated revenues of \$17.8 million; property tax increment of \$4.2 million; loans from the City of \$1.9 million; and bond proceeds from a proposed bond issue of \$10.5 million and other sources of \$1.7 million.

Proposed expenditures of \$13.3 million including State ERAF of \$312,000. The ending balance of \$7.2 million was proposed.

She then called upon Budget Committee Chairman McIntosh to present the Committee's findings for the 2005-2006 budget. He noted the following:

- 1) It was anticipated that the State would continue to extract resources from the cities
- 2) There was an increased risk of property tax decline.
- 3) The City had not gained any net long-term revenue resources.
- 4) No schedules for capital replacement was included to support the adequacy of the amount funded.
- 5) Rapid residential expansion would increase demands on scarce City resources.
- 6) A master plan for recreation and trails was lacking.
- 7) No substantial revenue sources had been created for the past several years.
- 8) Because most of the new development was within the boundaries of the Redevelopment Project Area, the increase in property tax revenue would be designated for the Redevelopment Agency and would not be directly available to the General Fund.

Mr. McIntosh then provided the following Committee recommendations:

- 1) Continue a thrifty attitude coupled with conservative actions relating to appropriate city services.
- 2) Prepare a lifetime capital replacement schedule for all capital equipment so that replacement costs could be projected and funded on an annual basis.
- 3) Explore new methods to provide city services.
- 4) Allocate funds to update the Parks Master Plan.
- 5) Review the current staffing levels of police services and plan for the needed increase in police services.
- 6) Increase staffing in the Public Works Department, if only on a temporary basis, depending upon funding.
- 7) Explore additional revenue sources, such as themed retail development, hotels, and traffic cameras.
- 8) Track expenditure of one-time revenue sources for subsequent review.
- 9) Conduct an analysis to ensure General Fund soundness, including projected property tax income, projected General Fund expenditure increases from expected increases in population along with project Redevelopment Agency tax increment resources.
- 10) Increase the General Fund Reserve annually by \$250,000.

In response to questions, City Manager Halloway stated that he proposed to add one Sheriff's Deputy in fiscal year 2006-2007 because of the increase in population; proceeds from the 2005-2006 bond issue would be spent on specific items yet to be determined. Consideration could be given to purchasing additional park land; constructing public facilities.

It was suggested that the Budget Committee consider the discussion relating to fire equipment and return with a recommendation

Mayor Petersen, on behalf of the City Council, thanked staff and the Budget Committee for their efforts in presenting the proposed budget. No action was taken.

The City Council and Agency Board recessed at 7:06 p.m. and the City Council reconvened at 7:15 p.m. with all members present. Mayor Petersen led the Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. No items were added or deleted.

### **Oral Reports/Public Participation**

Mayor Petersen announced that due to the number of people in attendance, the Community Room was open and equipped with a television for those who wished to be seated.

He also announced that the Loma Linda Branch Library was re-opened today after being closed for remodeling.

Amelia Spletzer addressed the City Council relating to a claim she filed for damages to her tire after hitting a pothole on Anderson Street just south of the eastbound freeway onramp. She asked that she be reimbursed for the cost of the tire. Mayor Petersen indicated that the claim was of record and thanked her for bringing it to the Council's attention.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

Councilman Umeda indicated that he was a Member of the Planning Commission when the item relating to the development of 2.5 acres located in the North Central Neighborhood was discussed and acted upon, and asked if that would constitute a conflict of interest for him at this time. City Attorney Holdaway stated that the subject item included both administrative and legislative acts; that the issue of due process as to any entitlement application could be raised if Councilman Umeda previously indicated a decision or a closed mind regarding consideration of further evidence at this meeting. If, however, Councilman Umeda felt he could be unbiased, then he could participate unless the applicant had any objection to his participation. The applicant stated that he had no objection.

### **Scheduled and Related Items**

CC-2005-066

**CRA-2005-027 – Joint meeting of the City Council and Redevelopment Agency to receive response to written and oral comments relating to an Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan to expand the Agency's eminent domain authority to residential uses (TO BE CONTINUED TO SEPTEMBER 13)**

The Agency Board reconvened at 7:20 with all members present. Mayor Petersen chaired the item, indicating that the item would be continued to September 13. No objection was noted.

**By common consent, the item was continued to September 13.**

The Agency Board recessed to allow completion of the City Council Agenda.

### **New Business**

**CC-2005-067 – Council Bill #O-2005-07 (First Reading/Set Second Reading and Public Hearing for June 14) – Amending the Loma Linda Municipal Code to add Chapter 8.24 to Title 8 to adopt by reference San Bernardino County Ordinance No. 3930 relating to inspection grading of food establishments**

City Manager Holloway introduced the item, stating that the ordinance would require restaurants to post a grade; that the program relating to the posting of inspection grades was sponsored by the County of San Bernardino. He noted that the County Health Department currently inspected all restaurants in Loma Linda and the only change would be that the inspection grade would be required to be posted.

Terry Williams, Program Manager for the County Environmental Health Division, provided a brief history of the grading system, noting that the Program was in response to the public's request for stronger enforcement relating to those restaurants having low scores. She elaborated that 13 out of 24 cities adopted the Program and 4 cities were in the process of adopting the Program. She reviewed the inspection process, the grading system, and methods to help assure a high level of standards in restaurants year round. She responded to questions.

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and unanimously carried to introduce Council Bill #O-2005-07 on First Reading and to set the Second reading and public hearing for June 14.**

**Scheduled and Related Items continued)**

**CC-2005-068 – Public Hearing – Council Bill #R-2005-35 – Ordering Annexation 68 to Landscape Maintenance District No. 1, Tract 16323 located on the south side of Mission Road, east of Pepper Avenue, west of and including the SCE Easement**

The public hearing was opened. John Snell of American Pacific Homes, owner and developer of the subject property, indicated that errors had been made in the assessment and that he requested language that would indicate that the assessment would be applied only if and when the Homeowners Association failed to maintain the landscaped areas. He asked that the item be continued to June 14, pending resolution of the issues.

No other public testimony was offered.

**By common consent, the public hearing was continued to June 14.**

**CC-2005-069 – Public Hearing – Council Bill #R-2005-36 – Approving the Annual Report and Assessments for Landscape Maintenance District No. 1 for fiscal year 2005-2006**

The public hearing was opened and Director of Public Works presented the report into evidence, stating that the City Council had previously adopted resolutions appointing an Engineer of Work, Preliminarily approving the assessments and setting the public hearing. He noted that the total assessment for fiscal year 2005-2006 would be \$346,475.

No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed.

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda and unanimously carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-36.**

**Resolution No. 2395**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda ordering the continued maintenance of Landscape Maintenance District Number 1, and confirming the Engineer's Report and Assessment for 2005/2006 fiscal year

**CC-2005-070 – Public Hearing – Council Bill #R-2005-37 – Approving the Annual Report and Assessments for Street Light Benefit Assessment District for fiscal year 2005-2006**

The public hearing was opened and Director of Public Works Thaipejr presented the report into evidence, stating that the Street Light District was Citywide; that the total anticipated assessment for fiscal year 2005-2006 was \$293,190.

No other public testimony was offered, and the public hearing was closed.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Brauer and unanimously carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-37.**

**Resolution No. 2396**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda ordering the continued maintenance of Street Light Benefit Assessment District No. 1, and confirming the Engineer's Report, and levying assessment for fiscal year 2005-2006.

**CC-2005-071 – Public Hearing – Council Bill #R-2005-32 – Establishing Commercial and CoLocation Rates for the Loma Linda Connected Community Program and repealing Resolution No. 2362**

The public hearing was opened and City Manager Halloway presented the report into evidence, stating that the proposed resolution retained previously approved rates for residential users and added rates for potential commercial users as well as those co-locating in the City's facility.

No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed.

**Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-32.**

**Resolution No. 2397**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, establishing the rules, regulations and rates for the Loma Linda Connected Community Service and repealing Resolution No. 2362

**CC-2005-072 – Consent Calendar**

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Christman and unanimously carried to approve the following items:**

The Demands Register dated May 24, 2005 with commercial demands totaling \$1,697,661.63 and payroll demands totaling \$182,849.31.

The Minutes of April 12, 2005 as presented.

Request from Area E Disaster Management for membership in the California Joint Powers Insurance Authority.

Award of contract for the installation of a driveway at the Bennett Well Site to Avila Construction, San Bernardino for \$44,600 and a contingency allocation of \$4,500.

Council Bill #R-2005-38.

**Resolution No. 2398**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, approving the Subdivision Agreement for Final Tract Map 16323 (south side of Mission Road between Pepper Way and the Southern California Edison Easement)

The Community Development Block Grant City-County Delegate Agency Agreements for fiscal years 2006-2007 through 2008-2009.

Installation of sidewalks and access ramps at various locations in the North Central Neighborhood as complete and recordation of a Notice of Completion, Portsmouth Construction, Inc., Chino, contractor.

Supplemental appropriation of \$60,000 for engineering inspection services by Willdan Associates.

**CC-2005-073 – Public Hearing – 2.5 acres located in the North Central Neighborhood, adjacent to the San Timoteo Channel and accessed from Lilac and Lane Streets**

- a. Mitigated Negative Declaration
- b. Council Bill #R-2005-23 -- General Plan Amendment No. 03-02, Amending the General Plan Land Use Designation from Low Density Residential R-1 (1 to 4 dwelling units per acre) to Medium Density Residential (5.1-9 dwelling units per acre)
- c. Council Bill #O-2005-05 (First Reading/Set Second Reading for June 14) – Zone Change 03-02 from R-1 Single Family Residential to PC, Planned Community
- d. Tentative Tract Map 15738 – to subdivide 2.5 acres into 16 single-family lots
- e. Precise Plan of Design 04-08
- f. Council Bill #O-2005-06 (First Reading/Set Second Reading for June 14) – Development Agreement between SGA Loma Linda Estates, LP and the City to assist with future affordable housing needs throughout the city

The public hearing was opened and Associate Planner Colunga presented his report into evidence, stating that the original plan showed Lane and Lilac streets connecting; however the plan was modified to cul-de-sac State Street at Lane Street and also Lilac Street which was shown as the design alternative as recommended by the Planning Commission to address concerns of the neighbors. He went on to say that the minimum lot size was 4,000 square feet; the density was 6.5 dwelling units per acre; and all of the lots were front-loaded. He stated that the project consisted of both attached and detached single and two-story units. A private drive at the end of Lilac Street provided access to three lots; a pedestrian easement from the private drive to State Street provided neighborhood connectivity. No common area or park space was

proposed in that the applicant would contribute by way of paying fees. A Homeowners Association would maintain the front yard landscaping of the 16 homes.

Mr. Colunga then showed architectural plans and reviewed the Conditions of Approval. He also noted that the project was within the North Central Neighborhood of the Redevelopment Area and the applicant would satisfy the affordable housing obligation by way of a Development Agreement with a minimum payment of \$55,072 toward affordable housing to be built elsewhere in the City.

He referred to a letter submitted by Juan Uribe supporting the design alternative and a letter from Carl Sahlin in opposition to the design alternative and requesting that Lane and State Street connect and not be cul-de-sacs. Mr. Colunga noted that the right-of-way for the connection of State and Lilac Streets was acquired by the City a number of years ago; the Public Works and Public Safety Departments indicated cul-de-sacs were acceptable.

Sal Gottuso, applicant, 452 Sara Drive, Corona Del Mar, stated that he owned the property for nine years; a 27-unit project was proposed but vehemently opposed by the residents; the proposal was modified and supported by the neighborhood. He asked that the project be approved. He introduced his son Carl, as well as civil engineer, architect and landscape architect, who were available to respond to questions.

Staff responded to questions relating to the Homeowners Association and the Development Agreement pertaining to affordable housing.

Others speaking were: Debbie Ingalls, 25448 Lane Street; Polly Lay, 25331 Mead Street; Cindy Chrisler, 25446 Lane Street; who supported the alternative design; and Leland Lubinsky, 24818 Redlands Boulevard, who opposed increasing density from low density to medium density without addressing amenities such as a park in the area.

No other public testimony was offered, and the public hearing was closed.

**Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration; Council Bill #R-2005-23 relating to General Plan Amendment No. 03-02; the First Reading of Council Bill #O-2005-05 relating to Zone Change 03-02; Tentative Tract Map 15738; Precise Plan of Design 04-08; and the First Reading of Council Bill #O-2005-06 relating to the Development Agreement for future affordable housing.**

**Resolution No. 2399**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, amending the Land Use Element of the Adopted General Plan (GPA No. 03-02)

The City Council recessed at 8:27 p.m. and reconvened at 8:34 p.m. with all members present.

**CC-2005-074 – Public Hearing – 308 acres located north of Mission Road, south of Redlands Boulevard, east of the Southern California Edison Easement, and west of California Street**

- a. Environmental Impact Report
- b. Council Bill #R-2005-33 – General Plan Amendments Nos. 02-02 and 02-05, Amending the General Plan Land Use Designation from Business & Research Park (with support uses), Elementary School, and Community Park to Mixed Use
- c. Council Bill #O-2005-08 (First Reading/Set Second Reading for June 14) – Zone Change Nos. 02-02 and 02-05 from Single-Family Residence (R-1), General Business (C-2), East Valley Corridor Specific Plan Special Development and Public Institutional to Planned Community (PC)
- d. Council Bill #R-2005-34 – Adopting Specific Plan Nos. 02-08 and 02-13 (University Village and Orchard Park for the subdivision of 308 acres into approximately 2,500 units, including mixed-use units, multi-family and single-family residences; over 1 million square feet of commercial/office use, 15.7 acres of institutional, 19.17 acres of park land and an elementary school
- e. Council Bill #O-2005-09 – (First Reading/Set Second Reading for June 14) – Adopting Specific Plan Nos. 02-08 and 02-13 (University Village and Orchard Park for the subdivision of 308 acres into approximately 2,500 units, including mixed-use units, multi-family and single-family residences; over 1 million square feet of

commercial/office use, 15.7 acres of institution, 19.17 acres of park land and an elementary school

Mayor Petersen commented that the General Plan was in the process of being updated and several issues were yet to be resolved relating to the University Village and Orchard Park projects; therefore, no action was expected this evening.

The public hearing was opened. Director of Community Development Woldruff recommended that the presentation be given and that the item be continued to June 14. She then stated that several years ago, the Planning Commission and City Council agreed that because of the potential effects of both projects, that one environmental document be prepared for both projects. The Historical Commission and Planning Commission provided recommendations relating to individual resources affected by the projects as well as overall recommendations contained in Attachments 1 and 2 to the Staff Report.

She went on to say that the original request for the projects were to change the General Plan Land Use Designation from Business and Research Park and Support Uses, Elementary School, and Community Park to a Mixed Use Designation. There was also a request to change the Zoning Map from Single-Family Residence (R-1), General Business (C-2) and East Valley Corridor Specific Plan and Public Institution to Planned Community (PC) in order to accommodate the adoption of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.

Mrs. Woldruff stated that the specific plans provided for future subdivision of 308 acres into 677 single-family units, 1,760 multi-family units, 591 mixed use residential units, 675,118 square feet of commercial space, 459,558 square feet of commercial office within the mixed use area, 15.7 acres of institutional, 19.7 acres of park land, and an elementary school. She noted that the University Village Specific Plan occupied the westerly portion of the site and the Orchard Park Specific Plan occupied the easterly portion of the site.

During the process, density for both projects was reduced by 531 units, a decrease of 18 percent. The total number of units proposed for University Village was 1,507, including mixed use units, multi-family and single-family residences. The total number of units for Orchard Park was 990, including mixed use units, multi-family and single-family residences.

She continued that the Planning Commission's review of the project took place over a six-month period; the layout was supported, but density was a concern in terms of placement and the total number of units. The Planning Commission recommended that the overall density for both projects be reduced further and that the density to the south toward Mission Road be much lower than the density near Redlands Boulevard. The Planning Commission also required that lot sizes on Mission Road and in the vicinity of Mission Road be a minimum of 9,000 to 10,000 square feet. The Commission also recommended that the projects include no small lot subdivisions unless the units were attached to differentiate the projects on the north side of Mission Road from the character of the projects on the south side of Mission Road. The residential densities for both projects were to be no more than 4.5 dwelling units per acre, excluding non-residential acreage. Based on the 4.5 dwelling units per acre, the number of units would not exceed 1,300 dwelling units, which was consistent with the Planning Commission's recommendation on the General Plan for Special Planning Area D. The revised projects proposed a total of 2,497 units for the residential and non-residential mixed-use areas, which exceeded densities recommended by the Planning Commission for both projects as well as the General Plan. The Planning Commission recommended that 4.5 dwelling units per acre be allowed within the truly residential neighborhoods and the non-residential neighborhoods encompassing vertical mixed use, could allow a floor area ratio to accommodate the units above commercial and office uses and possibly have storefronts with rear residential units.

Mrs. Woldruff recommended that the Environmental Impact Report be reviewed and considered on June 14. The financial aspects of the projects involved the sale of Agency-owned land to Lewis Operating Corporation. Plan check, building, construction, and development impact fees for future projects within the specific plan area would also contribute to financial impacts of both projects. She then asked that the applicants present their projects.

Randall Lewis of Lewis Operating Corporation addressed the City Council to introduce the University Village Project, stating that the project had taken seven years, during which time several meetings were held to obtain community, staff and City Council input. He highlighted aspects of the specific plan, stating that it was a market driven community. Extensive research was conducted relating to current residents, employment, and unmet needs so that the development could meet the needs of the community and its residents in its affordable, senior, multi-family and single-family housing components. The community was proposed to be a walkable community with a strong trails system and streets that lead to parks, recreation centers, and schools, and was void of cul-de-sacs. It was a fiscally sound development and a plan that would facilitate a much-needed school in a location that encouraged walking to school. The plan had strong design standards in its architecture and landscaping. Amenities would be established up front that would offer life-style opportunities by way of a 15,000 square foot clubhouse maintained by



a homeowners association that would maintain, manage, and provide programming of classes and activities.

He then introduced Gil Prestwood, who introduced Leon Swails, Chief Operating Officer and stated consultants were available to respond to questions and concerns. He stated that the plan started with a walkable, livable, neotraditional neighborhood design, various aspects of which were used to create the community under consideration.

Mr. Prestwood explained that University Village extended from Redlands Boulevard to the north to Mission Road to the south; an apartment complex was adjacent to the west and to the east was the Orchard Park Project. Streets and uses in both projects aligned.

He elaborated that University Village was a master planned community with an HOA to maintain all of the private and public park areas in the project. A variety of housing products were provided, including a senior affordable housing site, workforce housing, 300 luxury apartments that Lewis Operating Corporation would retain and operate, as well as retail along Redlands Boulevard that would not only serve residents within the development, but the entire city and surrounding areas as well.

He indicated that the amenities included a seven-acre central park, 15,000 square-foot park house on a three-acre private recreation area; 5.4-acre heritage park for relocation and maintenance of historical resources; 2.8-acre Frink Adobe Historic Park that would preserve orange groves and provide an area for relocation of other historic resources. The school site was proposed for a K-5 school to be completed so that it would be available at approximately the same time as the need arose due to the residential development. An extensive trail system would also be provided as well as improvements to Mission Road.

He projected that the project as proposed would produce \$19 million in impact fee, and that the tax roll would increase from approximately \$8 million to approximately \$400 million, based on current markets.

Mr. Prestwood reviewed concerns of the Planning Commission and response from Lewis Operating Corp as follows:

- 1) The town center, need for a destination center, and parking. He explained that in the area of the extension of Bryn Mawr Avenue at Redlands Boulevard, conceptually a 20,000-30,000 square foot building was proposed to accommodate a market with parking; also a restaurant and other retail uses. He stated that the University Village Project was displayed at the ICSC shopping center convention in Las Vegas to test for interest. He proposed a 100-foot wide street with 20-foot middle island, wide plaza areas in front of retail along both entrances to University Village that would create services for the community and passers by. The Bryn Mawr/Redlands Boulevard intersection would be fully signalized. To relate retail and residential, there would also be paseos that would lead to gates, open areas, red iron areas with heavy planting to provide pedestrian friendly access throughout the project.
- 2) Outside architect to review design guidelines. To be discussed in conjunction with staff.
- 3) Feasibility of elevator for senior housing. Senior housing consisted of stacked flats, so half would be ground level to suit the needs of those less ambulatory.
- 4) 20%-30% of the single units in the single-family portion of the project be single story. The single-family detached product on lots of greater than 4,000 square feet could be one story or one-and-on-half stories.
- 5) Linear park to the west of University Village. A portion of the area west of the project was privately owned. Connection to a linear project could be planned in the future as a regional issue as the trail is further developed.
- 6) Tiered density in relation to Ordinance 623, the Historical Overlay Zone Ordinance. Larger lots and less density were desired within the Historical Mission Overlay Zone. Larger lots of 8,000 to 10,000 square foot lots would be provided along Mission Road.
- 7) Rhonda Street and the preservation of existing oak trees at the eastern boundary of University Village. Lewis Operating Corp would work with staff to arrive at an optimum means to preserve most of the oak trees and still provide a safe roadway.

He displayed a conceptual plan as to how the units would be plotted, subject to the Precise Plan of Design and conceptual review process; the central park, pool, putting green, tennis, basketball, tot lots, and park

house recreation areas; Heritage Park, Frink Adobe Historic Park, and Zanja Trail; the luxury apartment area, cluster type multi-family area with private recreation and pool area; school site, and trail system.

Mr. Prestwood stated that prior to residential occupancy, improvements such as the traffic signal at Bryn Mawr and Redlands Boulevard, Redlands Boulevard landscaping, central park, park house, putting green, tennis courts, interior loop streets for circulation, landscaping for Heritage Park, the Zanja Trail as well as Mission Road improvements would be completed.

Councilman Brauer stated that at one time there was concern about the subject parcel developing into all residential development, and effort was made to develop a high-tech park or business park. Mr. Prestwood responded that when the retail was functioning on Redlands Boulevard, momentum for the adjacent areas would be created. Mr. Prestwood indicated that the time frame to complete the project was estimated to be four to six years.

Clyde Holland, Chairman of the Holland Partner Group and representing the Orchard Park Specific Plan, affirmed the presentation by Lewis Operating Corp. with significant effort to build a community and to integrate the projects with each other and the surrounding community. He stated that the Kunihiro Group, Cal-88, owned the majority of the Orchard Park area; the property was a significant opportunity to develop the project from a commercial standpoint, but also included the donation of land for a Japanese church. He introduced Tom Warren, president of the development company; Bradley Korvasic, the partner for Southern California and stated that an office was maintained in Ontario.

Mr. Holland then introduced the Orchard Park Project, an area between Redlands Boulevard and the realignment of Mission Road. One of the challenges was to support commercial uses on Redlands Boulevard; recognizing that California Street would become a major arterial; and the desire for mixed use and retail along with commercial to be developed along California Street. The densities were to support commercial uses on Redlands Boulevard as well as the mixed-use elements on California Street.

He referred to the termination of Mission Road so that it would not extend to California Street because of the conflicts with Barton Road, and stated that Mission Road was proposed to be re-aligned to Orange Street and intersect with California Street at Orange Street. He then indicated that densities decreased toward Mission Road and increased in the areas of retail/commercial uses.

Mr. Holland elaborated on the Orchard Park Project, stating that it consisted of 138 acres which encompassed an area owned by the Kunihiras, the Redlands Unified School District, and the RV Park. At California Street and Redlands Boulevard, there was opportunity to develop a commercial core to be supported by surrounding residential. The more active commercial/retail/office uses were located closer to California Street; commercial densities were also located on California Street at the intersections of Citrus and Orange, with the parcels between Citrus and Orange planned as a live/work community. The Orchard Park Project started in the area of Redlands Boulevard and Rhonda Street. A round about was proposed to allow access and traffic calming. In the area of Mission Road, the historic house that currently houses Inland Temporary Homes and was the site of orange groves would be preserved; the Zanja Trail would be connected to a park. No housing was proposed for Mission Road except for the area where Mission Road was proposed to terminate. The neighborhood retail would be located at Citrus to enter the community and allow a link with the Medical Center not only from a use standpoint with the location of a small urgent care facility, but also from a transportation standpoint.

Addressing the area of Redlands Boulevard and Rhonda Street, a 240 unit apartment project was proposed with 127 units of row houses, an open trail to connect the site with four neighborhoods, the school, and park land consisting of two soccer fields.

Addressing circulation and transit services, he stated that main entrances were located at Park, Citrus and Orange with transit nodes that could possibly link the LLUMC shuttle service with the new community. Public open space was provided through the preservation of orange groves, the Zanja Trail, an active park in and around the single-family residential area, a main park in the heart of the community, a linear park to connect the retail and trail system through the community, a children's play area, and a park within the multi-family area.

Mr. Holland indicated that within the EIR, the project was anticipated to be 1,260 units. Density was reduced to 990 units with higher densities located in the live/work area near California Street and adjacent to commercial uses, transitioning in the single-family area with decreased densities near Orange Avenue with no residential in the Mission Road area.

He elaborated that Loma Linda was job rich; however, the housing need was acute. The Orchard Park project proposed to address the live/work issue; the senior movement to smaller units; families just starting out as well as families seeking larger units.

Director of Community Development Woldruff submitted a letter from the Redlands Unified School District for the record, which referred to the critical need of one middle school, one and perhaps two additional elementary schools within the City of Loma Linda or within its Sphere of Influence, based upon the projected addition of 4,000 homes.

Mayor Petersen then called for public comment, noting that due to the lateness of the hour, comments would be limited to three minutes. Also, no action would be taken this evening.

Those speaking were: James Stocker, 26234 Mission Road; Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road; Robert Horner, 3973 Holly Springs, Corona; Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue; David Werner, 11469 Campus Street; speaker for Savat Khamphou, 33578 Brushy Hollow Drive; Ovi Popescu, 25523 State Street; and Leland Lubinsky, 24818 Redlands Blvd.

Summary of comments is as follows:

- 1) The University Village Project proposed driveways onto Mission Road; homes on Mission Road should be served from the interior to avoid driveways on Mission Road.
- 2) Two-story homes should not adjoin existing homes.
- 3) California Street should be aligned and expanded to six lanes.
- 4) The school site should be increased and a major artery from California Street should provide access to the school.
- 5) Neither project preserved or enhanced a rural atmosphere.
- 6) Traffic planning was inconsistent with the General Plan and General Plan Update.
- 7) The projects were too dense in that the density exceeded density on the south side of Mission Road.
- 8) The oak trees, farmhouse, and Mission School should be preserved.
- 9) The motions of the Historical Commission relating to both projects should be taken seriously by the City Council.
- 10) Both projects proposed healthy communities because they promoted walking and interaction among residents.
- 11) There should be more walk-ability within the retail areas.
- 12) The communities proposed appear to be self-sustaining.
- 13) Traffic was of great concern.
- 14) The lots were too small to provide large back yards.
- 15) Vertical density versus horizontal density was preferred.
- 16) Loma Linda has a tradition of cottage/garden homes.

Richard Kunihiro read statements from Ben Register, 104 Dale Street, West Falmouth, MA., and Kenneth W. Rogers, Woodland Hills, both of whom were partners in Cal-88 and supported the Orchard Park Project as well as the Holland .Partner Group as developer.

[Councilman Christman left at 10:30 p.m.]

**By common consent, the item was continued to June 14.**

Mayor Petersen declared the meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 7, 2005 for the purpose of conducting a public hearing/workshop pertaining to land use in the South Hills as part of the General Plan Update.

Approved at the meeting of

---

City Clerk

City of Loma Linda

City Council Minutes

Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 7, 2005

An adjourned regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor Petersen at 6:17 p.m., Tuesday, June 7, 2005 in the Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:

Mayor Floyd Petersen  
Mayor pro tempore Stan Brauer  
(Left at approximately 6:25 p.m.)  
Robert Christman  
Robert Ziprick  
Charles Umeda

Councilman Absent:

None

Others Present:

City Manager Dennis Halloway  
City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

No Items were added or deleted.

**CC-2005-075 - Conflict of Interest**

Councilman Brauer declared a possible conflict of interest due to his personal residence and ownership of property in the hillside area. After conferring with the City Attorney, he felt it best that he not participate in the discussion or decision. He left the Council Chamber.

Councilman Ziprick asked that the City Attorney review the location of his residence in relation to the hillside area. The City Attorney explained that if the residence were within 500 feet of the subject property for which development standards were proposed to be changed, there was a presumption of a material financial effect. There was not the same level of concern if property was outside the limit because then the change affects the entire city in the same manner. In viewing the map, it appeared that Councilman Ziprick's property was beyond the 500-foot scope.

**Scheduled and Related Items**

**CC-2005-076 - Land use in the South Hills as part of the General Plan Update**

Mayor Petersen opened the public hearing and noted that there were different types of property that should be considered separately, such as the area south of Beaumont Avenue but not meeting the toe of the slope and the Allen Break Estates property that could be removed from the Hillside Designation for discussion purposes. The City Attorney concurred in that nothing was being proposed to change the Hillside Initiative requirement; the discussion was concerned with other General Plan issues for the overall area; therefore the Allen Break Estates parcel could be excluded to avoid a conflict issue.

Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that the City Council began its review of the Hillside Designation on April 26, at which time an overview was presented that resulted in direction to staff and the consultant to revise the text to simplify distribution of density transfers.

She referred to letters submitted to the City Council pertaining to property owned by Douglas Welebir, noting that the Planning Commission recommended that the property be excluded from the Hillside Designation or Initiative Areas. She also stated that a packet of material was presented on behalf of Mission Development Company as well as a letter on behalf of Chris Taylor of Empire Homes and property owner Leroy Hansberger.

Mrs. Woldruff stated that some of the policies would affect the Hillside area and the Initiative Area because they apply to density transfers.

She then introduced Lynn Calvert Hayes of LSA Associates, Inc., sitting in for Lloyd Zola, and who was the lead on the City's General Plan EIR and was very familiar with the documentation under consideration this evening.

Mrs. Woldruff stated that a policy was added to require,

a maximum of 775 dwelling units that may be developed within land designated as Hillside Conservation, including both lands within and outside of the area subject to the

City's Hillside Initiative. In addition, up to one-half of the allowable density within the area designated "Very Low Residential Density" that is located at the base of the South Hills (the area off of Beaumont Avenue that extends to the railroad tracks) may be transferred into the Hillside Conservation land use designation if both areas (the bench area as well as the area its transferred into) are part of a comprehensive specific plan prepared for proposed development in both areas.

Achievement of the maximum residential build out cited above is not guaranteed; the actual yield of any development will be the result of a site design based upon:

- Site-specific physical characteristics;
- The need for mitigation or avoidance of impact to biological habitats;
- The environmental sensitivity of proposed site design, grading, and type of construction;
- Available on-site and off-site access; and
- The ability of the proposed project to avoid impacts on other properties.

Consistent with these principles, allowable density may be transferred from the areas targeted for open space acquisition as illustrated in Figure (to be determined) to other areas designated "Hillside" based on the density identified in Table 2.B that would be permitted within a clustered development provided an appropriate area of land targeted for acquisition is placed in permanent open space.

She also referred to a new Policy "e" that states,

Development should be clustered to avoid placement of dwelling units along north facing slopes that are visible from valley areas to the north. Development along such north facing slopes should be permitted only where there is no feasible building area other than such a north facing slope.

Policy "g" states,

Development along and adjacent to Pilgrim Lane shall respect the existing rural character of the area.

- Development adjacent to existing rural residential areas along Pilgrim Lane that will be accessed from Pilgrim Lane shall have a density and minimum lot size compatible with existing rural residential uses.
- The ability of rural development along Pilgrim Lane to engage in agriculture and commercial animal-keeping activities shall be protected.
- Development within planned communities adjacent to Pilgrim Lane shall be designed to provide adequate buffer areas adjacent to rural residential uses.

Policy "h" states,

New development shall provide a trail system that will link with future dedicated trails consistent with the South Hills Trails Master Plan.

She elaborated that although the City did not have a formal master plan at this time, the implementation measure to develop a master plan was included in the General Plan.

She noted a revision was made to Policy "I" that originally placed the set back at 50 feet horizontally and vertically to avoid the primary ridgelines. Policy "I" now reads,

Development shall maintain appropriate horizontal and vertical setbacks from "primary ridgelines, which are the ridgelines mapped on Figure (to be designated) having the following characteristics (which are the existing characteristics.)

Mrs. Woldruff noted changes regarding "u" and "v" where one policy was divided into two policies as follows:

- u. Use of alternative infrastructure (e.g., septic systems) may be permitted in areas where municipal systems feasibly cannot be extended.
- v. The cost of infrastructure to serve the South Hills area shall be the responsibility of development within the South Hills.

In response to questions concerning densities, she stated that within the "Very Low Residential" designation for the bench area off of Beaumont Avenue, there were 205 acres and potentially 410 lots, based on a density of two units per acre; thus, there would be 410 lots outside of the Initiative Area. Within the "Hillside Conservation" area, there would be one dwelling unit per two acres, which calculated to 566 units. In the "Conservation Hillside" (Initiative area of 1,047 acres), if calculations considered clustered development at 5 units per acre, there was potential for 209 units. The total number of units equated to 775 units in the South Hills plus the 410 units that could be transferred from the bench, which then totaled 1,185 units. The number of units presumed that City-owned land would be designated as "open space" with a density of zero.

Councilman Christman expressed concern that because densities were defined, applicants believed they had a right to the highest density allowed. City Attorney Holdaway responded that the City Council, through the General Plan or Zoning Code, specifies a range of density with a maximum indicated; however, there is no right to the maximum of the range of density. Density is subject to the Council's review and approval, based upon various factors, such as amenities, infrastructure requirements, etc., therefore, the applicant may or may not obtain the maximum density.

Councilman Christman also asked about the letter from Mr. Welebir, which stated that there were plans for the property. Councilman Christman's concern related to changes in zoning as part of the General Plan process, noting that zoning was not a vested right. The City Attorney responded that the City Council sets the General Plan, which is followed by bringing zoning into consistency with the General Plan. A property owner that has not obtained entitlement approvals would be subject to the new General Plan and new zoning.

Mayor Petersen interrupted the public hearing for public participation comments.

#### **Oral Reports/Public Participation**

Marji Barakian, 11464 Via Lido, addressed the City Council relating to traffic in the Bryn Mawr School area, noting that the Redlands Unified School District would be charging for bus service; therefore, she anticipated more vehicular traffic as parents drove their children to school, and more pedestrian traffic because more children would be walking to school. She asked that crossing guards be considered. Division Chief Crawford stated that in the past crossing guards were not justified because of the small number of children walking to school; however, it could be reviewed in light of the School District's action.

#### **CC-2005-076 - Land use in the South Hills as part of the General Plan Update (continued)**

Jim Shipp, 11553 Cedar Way, distributed the Lugo Designo of the Rancho San Bernardino from the Secretary of State that dates to 1842, noting that the Lugo family acquired the valley consisting of 37,000+ acres for \$800 in cattle hides in 1842. At the bottom of the map is shown "Lomas Lindero." He stated that the Loma Linda hills have been a boundary and not heavily developed, and suggested that much of the hills be retained in open space; that clustering be encouraged.

Councilman Umeda commented that it is the consensus of the City Council that a large portion of the South Hills be preserved in its natural state and efforts have been made to reach that goal; however, a balance must be reached relating to development and open space.

Joe Bonadiman, 234 Arrowhead Avenue, a civil engineer and representative of the Ramirez family, owners of property along Beaumont Avenue and in the South Hills, supported the recommendations of staff.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, asked that information regarding the General Plan be advertised on the City's web site well in advance of meetings at which it is the topic of discussion. She suggested that the General Plan include a caveat relating to a zoning range as earlier stated by the City Attorney; that the zoning be maintained under which land was purchased; traffic, fire, police services and water will be impacted if the rate of building continues; minimum lot size should be 7,200 square feet; and expressed concern about the geology in the South Hills.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, noted that the area of preservation was unclear in that the acquisition area and primary ridge line figures were missing; excluding Mr. Welebir's land from the Hillside designation was inappropriate, in his opinion; location of housing and circulation was unclear; access should come from the least environmentally-sensitive areas; other issues related to water supply, fire, mass grading, and clustering. He supported slope conforming foundations, an effective clustering scheme, preservation of open space, and appropriate access routes. Flat areas were appropriate areas to build, including the "playpen" area. He proposed maintaining baseline zoning and incentives for building in designated areas.

An extensive discussion occurred between Councilman Ziprick and Mr. Zirkle relating to possible development in Whittier Canyon.

In response to comments from Councilman Umeda relating to incentives, Mr. Zirkle stated that he consulted with a land use attorney because potentially an initiative may be needed.

The City Council recessed at 7:55 p.m. and reconvened at 8:08 p.m. with all members present, except Councilman Brauer.

Michael Christianson, 25241 Cottage Street, stated that an Historic Overlay Zone was placed on Mission Road; however, it was his opinion that the requirements of the Historic Overlay Zone had been violated. He also requested that language be placed in the General Plan to prohibit alteration of any ridgelines, expressed concern about Implementing Policy "i," and suggested that the word "appropriate" be carefully defined. He supported the City acquiring as much land in the South Hills as possible.

Kathy Glendrange, 26551 Beaumont Avenue, acknowledged that the majority of the City-owned land was designated as open space, the number of houses was reduced, and intrusiveness of new development was limited. She expressed concern that too many houses were still allowed; asked that Table 2.B set out a maximum allowable density; concurred with the comments of Jonathan Zirkle that it was difficult to calculate the maximum number of houses under the current draft of the General Plan; supported increase in density and clustering to preserve open space. She added that if buyers could afford expensive houses on large lots in the South Hills, then there should also be a market for 7,200 square foot lots in the City, and hoped that 7,200 square foot lots would become a standard instead of small lot subdivisions. The University Village and Orchard Park Developments were estimated to pay \$19 million in impact fees and also increase the tax rolls substantially, thus increasing the City's revenue; therefore, intensive development should not be allowed in the South Hills. She preferred maintaining a small town atmosphere, quality of life and less traffic rather than the City having more money in its coffers. She commented that there were several references to preserving habitat of endangered species, but only if the habitats were occupied, and in her opinion, that did not provide real protection. She questioned why approximately 80 acres of City-owned land around Hulda Crooks Park was not designated as open space and expressed concern about a citywide assessment to purchase land in the South Hills. She also concurred with the comments of Michael Christianson regarding ridgelines and defining "appropriate," and expressed concern about Paragraph "v" regarding cost of infrastructure in that the cost should be borne by new development and not passed on to existing development.

Councilman Christman responded that the property directly west of Hulda Crooks Park was a separate City purchase approximately nine years ago and was not included because it was not part of the purchase of land from the Resolution Trust Corporation.

Director of Community Development Woldruff indicated that the word "new" could be added to Paragraph "v" to clarify responsibility of infrastructure cost to new development.

Benjamin Nate', 11660 Emerald Drive, asked about having a Beverly Hills in the Inland Empire, perhaps the South Hills of Loma Linda.

Leroy Hansberger, 555 Cajon Street, Redlands, and property owner in the South Hills for 27 years, commented on the continuing focus on landowners and developers profit; stated that few knew what speculative landowners or developers do, why they do it, what they provide or their risk and rewards. The developer contributed to the real estate industry as well as the retail industries. Loma Linda was a job-generating center, but accommodated only 4,000 to 5,000 of its employees, while almost 10,000 came from outside the city on a daily basis, creating traffic, but were also the backbone of the city's major industry. There was a distinct lack of upper level housing. If the South Hills were properly developed, aesthetic desires as well as economic needs would be accomplished. Density was not the real issue, but rather design and the accommodation of middle to upper level housing for those who desire to live in the hills. The clustering concept would consume the least amount of property for appropriate hillside



housing. In the ordinary evolution of growth, finer homes migrate to the higher areas. In the west portion of the City, the city is built out, including the ridge. In Redlands, it was the same in that the ridges were not preserved. He concluded that the appropriate build out along with the appropriate conservation of land in the South Hills would strengthen the social structure, take human needs into consideration, and greatly enhance the community of Loma Linda.

Ted Stream, 11832 Sandra Court, and a land use and real estate litigator who typically represented developers, stated that he was not a member of the conservancy and was not associated with and did not represent any developers related to the subject issues and area. Interestingly, citizens were arguing that they ought to be able to continue to utilize private property for recreational purposes, while property owners/developers who bought the property under a different set of conditions were arguing that they should be allowed to develop their property. The idea that the hills were heavily utilized was not true. The real interest was the preservation of the aesthetics of the South Hills. In his opinion, the additional trips from housing in the South Hills should not be routed to Whittier Avenue, Bryn Mawr Avenue, or Beaumont Avenue, but rather Mt. View Avenue. Protecting the face of the hills was important, as were the existing groves. A community could be built in the groves. Density should be behind the ridge. Perhaps the developers could provide improvements to Hulda Crooks Park such as a recreational center at the park. The South Hills was a perfect place for a golf course and higher end homes to be accomplished in a reasonable and balanced way.

Chris Taylor of Empire Homes, stated that comments were submitted in writing. He commented that the General Plan process was good in that it brought issues forward; there was agreement on most issues; the disagreement appeared to concern a few hundred units over thousands of acres; traffic was not a difference at this point. He asked if the General Plan process would postpone the decision relating to development or allow a foundation so that the landowner could make a decision as to the utilization of their land. He urged that a decision be made so that property could be developed.

Glenn Elssmann, 25814 Business Center Drive, stated that the South Hills consisted of approximately 3,000 acres and encompassed one-half of the City. The northern portion of the City, encompassing the other half of the City, was comprised of 9,000 residential units and more were anticipated. Less than 30 percent of the South Hills was publicly owned; leaving 70 percent in private ownership. He elaborated that approximately one year ago, Mission Development received permission from the City to develop a comprehensive master plan for the South Hills that would include the City's property. The land area exceeded 2,000 acres. Large parcels of land that were controlled by few owners made a comprehensive plan achievable. Targeted open space was viewed from an acquisition aspect so that key features of the area could be preserved. The process produced agreement on the key issues, such as a comprehensive plan that could allow for open space in excess of 2,100 acres, which calculated to approximately one-third of the City or over 70 percent of the South Hills. Saving the north face of the hills was supported by the developers, as was eliminating houses from ridge tops; allowing trails and access through developments to maintain continuity was also supported, as was paying a fair share for infrastructure. Environmental review processes, as required, was supported. The area outside of the Initiative Area should be designated one unit per five acres, per Planning Commission recommendation, with a density bonus of one unit per two acres if the development were clustered. The Planning Commission recommended a density of up to two units per acre for the area north of the toe of the slope along Beaumont Avenue. Support was also given for conversion of open space into public ownership in perpetuity and traffic being dispersed to the east and west.

David Warner, 11469 Campus Street, commented that the City needed a wide spectrum of housing, including high-end housing. What was best for the City was of prime importance. Loma Linda was central to many areas, including medical facilities of Riverside, San Bernardino, and Redlands. The City needed million dollar estates to attract those who want to work in the facilities and places of employment the City provides. The issues were not about density or open space, but best use and what Loma Linda would do to be the great City it can be.

No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed. Extensive discussion ensued among Council Members, noting that approximately 70 percent of the hills would be preserved as open space, including City property; clustering was supported; agreement could be reached as to protection of sensitive areas. The issues included number of houses and traffic.

In response to questions, Community Development Director Woldruff stated that a traffic study was prepared as part of the EIR. There was also a document that addressed the Congestion Management Plan and a Traffic Impact Analysis. The General Plan process reduced densities and therefore an update to the traffic study was needed to analyze what the reduced densities meant to different roadways and in terms of Loma Linda's fair share toward the Congestion Management Plan, in that Loma Linda should not pay



for traffic that it won't have. An updated study would take approximately six weeks or longer; however, decisions on all of the land use densities were needed in order to update the traffic model, the cost of which be approximately \$6,000 to \$7,000.

Councilman Ziprick commented that the central area of the hills was the most rugged and the least desirable for economic development of houses, so any housing would be to the east and west. Acquisition or density transfers would accomplish retention of that area as open space. There were also circulation issues, such as potential connectors to alleviate potential problems on Beaumont Avenue as well as certain areas in the western portion of the City.

Mayor Petersen commented that the number of units proposed in the General Plan Update was substantially less than what was proposed in 2001. Agreement had been reached that in order to preserve open space, clustering must occur; however, he noted that in order to preserve public open space in its natural form by way of clustering, the area of clustering would require extensive grading. Mt. View Avenue should be utilized more than it is. Circulation needed to be more liberal in order to be more efficient.

Community Development Director Woldruff, based on the comments presented, suggested that staff be directed regarding the hillside issues, noting that another meeting was needed for the total Land Use Element, including issues related to the Special Planning Areas. She also stated that Lloyd Zola, the General Plan Consultant was leaving LSA Associates, but would be on contract with LSA to finish the General Plan. She suggested that the Land Use Element be continued to June 28 because the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans were scheduled for discussion on June 14. She also suggested that a special meeting to consider Land Use only could be scheduled.

Discussion ensued relating to completion of the General Plan prior to considering major projects such as the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.

The City Attorney responded to questions, stating that a Specific Plan was a legislative enactment similar to zoning or general plan, which must be considered by the City Council which has the responsibility to bring ensure consistency according to the policies set by the Council.

**By common consent, the Land Use Element of the General Plan was continued to June 28.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Approved at the meeting of

---

City Clerk

City of Loma Linda

City Council Minutes

Regular Meeting of June 14, 2005

A regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor Petersen at 7:03 p.m., Tuesday, June 14, 2005, in the City Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:	Mayor Floyd Petersen Mayor pro tempore Stan Brauer Robert Ziprick Charles Umeda
Councilman Absent:	Robert H. Christman
Others Present:	City Manager Dennis Halloway City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

Mayor pro tempore Brauer led the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. No items were added or deleted, nor were any conflicts of interest noted.

**Oral Reports/Public Participation**

Donna Stocker, 26234 Mission Road, commented on the condition of Mission Road due to construction in the area. City Manager Halloway stated that he spoke to the developer concerning the condition of the street and resolution. Mayor pro tempore Brauer also suggested contacting AQMD regarding the dust situation.

Mayor Petersen announced that Army National Guard Private Kenneth R. Christman, son of Councilman Christman, graduated from the Light Wheeled Vehicle Mechanic Advanced Individual Training Course at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland.

Mayor Petersen introduced Marvin and Joan Pendered, long-time friends.

**Scheduled and Related Items**

**CC-2005-077 – Proclamation – “Fun in the Sun, Safe Summer” May 30 through September 5, 2005**

Mayor Petersen read the proclamation and urged parents and families to actively supervise children so that they were safe in the water, in cars, on our roads and sidewalks. He indicated that Sue Taylor of Children's Network could not be present due to illness, but that the proclamation would be forwarded.

**CC-2005-078 – Public Hearing – Council Bill #O-2005-07 (Second Reading/Roll Call Vote) – Amending the Loma Linda Municipal Code to add Chapter 8.24 to Title 8 to adopt by reference San Bernardino County Ordinance No. 3930 relating to inspection grading of food establishments**

Mayor Petersen opened the public hearing. No public testimony was offered, and the public hearing was closed.

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to waive reading Council Bill #O-2005-07 in its entirety; direct the Clerk to read by title only and call the roll.**

The Clerk read the title and called the roll with the following results:

Ayes:	Petersen, Brauer, Ziprick, Umeda
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Christman

**Ordinance No. 634**

An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda adding Chapter 8.24 to Title 8 of the Loma Linda Municipal Code to adopt by reference San Bernardino County Ordinance No. 3930 adding Chapter 14 to Division 3 of Title 3 and adding Subsection 16.0213B(b)(17) to Chapter 2 of Division 6 of Title 1, all of the San Bernardino County Code, relating to inspection grading of food establishments

CC-2005-079 – Public Hearing – Council Bill #R-2005-35 – Ordering Annexation 68 to Landscape Maintenance District No. 1, Tract 16323 located on the south side of Mission Road, east of Pepper Way, west of and including the SCE Easement

The public hearing was opened and Director of Public Works Thaipejr presented the report into evidence. No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed. The City Clerk opened the Petition Envelope, noting that the Petition was signed by the property owner, and then opened the Ballot Envelope and stated that the property owner approved the proposed landscape maintenance assessment of \$2,495 per proposed parcel for a total of \$174,650 on the total lots or parcels for fiscal year 2005/2006.

In response to comments, the City Clerk stated that the Homeowners Association was responsible for the landscape maintenance; however, if the HOA failed, then the City's contractor would maintain the landscaping and the assessment would be applied.

The City Attorney stated that an agreement was being prepared at the request of John Snell of American Pacific Homes that provided clarification to the homebuyers that they would be subject to the assessment should the HOA fail to maintain the landscaping. It also provided the conditions of approval regarding the landscaping, which agreement would be recorded to provide notice to the buyers prior to property purchase.

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-35. Christman absent.**

**Resolution No. 2399**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda ordering the levy and collection of assessments for fiscal year 2005/2006 within Landscape Maintenance District No. 1, Annexation No. 68, Tract No. 16323, and confirming the Amended Engineer's Report pursuant to the Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972

CC-2005-080 – Public Hearing – Council Bill #r-2005-46 – Approval and Certification of the Draft Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (Final EIR includes: Draft EIR, Response to Comments, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and Findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations) based on the Findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations that the project benefits outweigh the potential negative impacts of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plan Projects – 208 acres located north of Mission Road, south of Redlands Boulevard, east of the Southern California Edison Easement, and west of California Street (Continued from May 24)

The public hearing was opened. Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that in 2001, the City Council determined that the projects were to have a joint EIR; RBF Consulting was chosen. She elaborated that a summary of the environmental process was included in the staff report, noting that the 45-day public review period began in March and extended to May of 2004; during that period comments were received; comments that are part of the Final Draft EIR were prepared; the results of the environmental analysis indicates that there were impacts to aesthetics/light and glare, air quality, land use and relevant planning, and noise that could not be mitigated to below a level of significance. She indicated that findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations were necessary; that the findings were contained in Attachment "A" to the staff report. She commented that because of the scope and nature of the project, it was subject to the Congestion Management Plan at the regional level, which resulted in a Traffic Impact Analysis that was incorporated into the EIR. There was also a separate Congestion Management Plan document that identified the City's fair share costs to CMP roadways and intersections. The CMP was not part of the EIR; however, the Traffic Study was based on the CMP. The EIR was subject to CEQA regulations and the Traffic Study was subject to CMP regulations.

The presentation proposed to address the EIR process, the findings of the analysis, as well as the outcome of the Environmental Impact Report. She then introduced Glenn LaJoie from RBF Consulting and a representative from Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc. to respond to questions concerning traffic.

Mr. LaJoie introduced Environmental Analyst Lindsay Anderson and John Kerenyi from Kimley-Horn, representing the Traffic Analysis. He then presented a summary of the Comprehensive Analysis and the resulting Final Environmental Impact Report. He highlighted elements of the EIR process, beginning with the Initial Study, a Notice of Preparation for a 30-day public review, which resulted in 14 comment letters being received; a second Notice of Preparation was issued due to the delays in the analysis and project modifications. No comment letters were received at the conclusion of the second 30-day period.

Preparation of the Draft EIR was begun, which was subject to a 45-day public review that concluded on October 22, 2004. The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on October 20. Twenty-one comment letters were received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. The Final Environmental Impact Report included responses to all comments received as well as the state-required Mitigation Monitoring Program in addition to the Draft Findings for Overriding Considerations pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.

Mr. LaJoie then highlighted the key issue areas that were studied and the conclusions for each as follows:

- 1) Land Use and Relevant Planning, including analysis of the General Plan Goals and Policies (the currently adopted General Plan as well as the General Plan Update Document); consideration of the Zoning Ordinance, Redevelopment Plan, and the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan, concluding that the project would result in significant growth-inducing impacts which would be inconsistent with the Regional Plan pursuant to SCAG and the associated policies.
- 2) Aesthetics/Light and Glare, which focused on short-term as well as long-term effects, with short term being the construction effects and long-term being build out of the project, concluding that there were significant, unavoidable impacts that could not be mitigated for views along Redlands Boulevard and Mission Road as a result of development of 300+ acres of undeveloped land to urban uses.
- 3) Traffic and Circulation which studied the traffic generated from the project, including a CMP Analysis, the effects on local roadways and intersections as well as cumulative effects, concluding that impacts would be mitigated to less than significant levels.
- 4) Air Quality during short-term construction emissions as well as long-term operation; consistency with Air Quality Management Plan, concluding that despite mitigation, the project would result in significant unavoidable impacts, both short-term and long-term, and would be inconsistent with the Regional Air Quality Plan.
- 5) Noise was studied for short-term construction and long-term build out of the project, concluding that there were significant unavoidable impacts in terms of construction noise as well as additional cars associated with the project and effects on roadways causing the noise effect that could not be mitigated to less than significant level.
- 6) Biological Resources (plant and animal species, special status species, wildlife movement corridors), concluding that impacts could be mitigated to less than significant levels. There were no significant unavoidable impacts.
- 7) Cultural Resources. The Historical Commission reviewed the EIR during several meetings. The EIR reviewed historical, archeological, and paleontological resources, concluding that impacts would be mitigated to less than significant levels. A comprehensive mitigation program was included in the Cultural Resources Chapter of the EIR.
- 8) Geology and Soils (stability of the property, seismic conditions) with mitigation measures identified and impacts mitigated to less than significant levels.
- 9) Hydrology (drainage); Water Quality in construction and build out. Mitigation measures were identified and impacts were reduced to less than significant levels.
- 10) Public Health and Safety. The property historically was utilized for orchards with utilization of pesticides. A comprehensive safety review that included hazardous materials, potential for asbestos and lead paint was analyzed. Mitigation measures were identified, so the project would not result in significant or unavoidable impacts.
- 11) Services and Utilities. Comprehensive review of utilities or resources utilized by the project and consultation with the providers, including fire, police, schools, library, parks, recreation, solid waste, water, wastewater, electricity, natural gas, concluding that impacts would be mitigated, resulting in no significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

Mr. LaJoie stated that the document concluded with project alternatives or EIR alternatives as required by CEQA Guidelines to reduce one or more significant effects. Alternatives included: no project as well as Orchard Park only or University Village Project only. There was also a revised University Village alternative as well as a revised Orchard Park alternative and a reduced residential alternative as well. It concluded that the University Village only was environmentally superior in that it was required by the CEQA Guidelines to identify the environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives.

He finished by stating that part of the certification review and consideration would include the findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations. He then displayed the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines for effects found not to be significant, effects determined to be mitigated to less than significant, findings regarding infeasible mitigation measures, and findings regarding alternatives.

Mr. LaJoie responded to questions. John Kerenyi of Kimley-Horn & Associates, Riverside, a Registered Traffic Engineer, addressed concerns about traffic, stating that the project proceeded with the General Plan Update; the data provided by LSA Associates, the General Plan Consulting Firm, was used for the Traffic

Study, noting that University Village and Orchard Park projects involved the majority of the open space in the subject area of the City. The roadway network recommended by the General Plan Update, which is consistent with the Land Use Plan, would be implemented by the projects, so that the roadway improvements required by the General Plan associated with the traffic from the projects would be built by the developments.

In response to questions concerning archeology, it was indicated that an archeologist would be on-site during construction. Director of Community Development Woldruff elaborated that the Mission Zanja was located as well as the Dinky track. She stated that a comprehensive archeological dig of the entire site had not been accomplished because of disruption to the land as well as cost; however, the monitoring process allowed for documentation and the projects to progress.

Community Development Director Woldruff suggested that because certification of the EIR at this point was not requested, and because the Land Use Element of the General Plan Update had not been finalized, that subsequent to taking public testimony, the item be continued.

Lirlie Horner, 3981 Holly Springs, Corona, stated that planned communities were well organized, but expressed concern that portions of the projects could be sold, which could result in a much different development.

Dick Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, asked about the impacts of traffic not only from the developments, but also within the region and its impact on the projects.

No other public testimony was offered.

Councilman Ziprick commented that a letter from the Redlands Unified School District was received after the comment period that suggested two elementary schools and a middle school be considered for the area. Community Development Director Woldruff stated that during the process, the School District was consulted intensively; the current request regarding school sites, which was submitted for the General Plan Update, was somewhat of a surprise, given the information received previously.

Discussion ensued relating to a date for continuance of the item.

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda and carried to continue the item to June 28, with the understanding that a further continuance may be necessary. Councilman Christman absent.**

Councilman Umeda asked that the Traffic Engineer to verify the statistics at Anderson Street and Redlands Boulevard.

**CC-2005-081 – Public Hearing – 1.46 acres between the southern end of San Juan Drive and San Mateo Drive, north of Barton Road**

- a. Mitigated Negative Declaration
- b. Council Bill #R-2005-44 – General Plan Amendment 04-04 – Amending the General Plan Land Use Designation from Medium Density (5.1-10 dwelling units per acre) to Medium Density (5.1-9 dwelling units per acre)
- c. Council Bill #O-2005-00 (First Reading/Set Second Reading for June 28) – Zone Change 04-04, Amending the Zoning Map from R-2 (Duplex) to Planned Community (PC)
- d. Tentative Tract Map 17209 to divide 1.46 acres into 13 single-family residential lots for attached units.
- e. Precise Plan of Design No. 04-09 relating to development standards and design guidelines for the project
- f. Council Bill #O-2005-12 (First Reading/Set Second Reading for June 28) – Approving a Development Agreement between Elizabeth Iskander and the City to assist with future affordable housing needs throughout the city

The public hearing was opened, and Assistant Planner Colunga presented the report into evidence, stating that the proposed townhouse project complied with the General Plan designation of Medium Density (5.1-9

dwelling units per acre); the proposed zone change would designate the zoning as Planned Community. He elaborated that the project encompassed two levels, the upper portion off of San Juan and the lower portion off of San Mateo. The project required demolition of two existing structures that were included in the Hathaway Historic Survey list; the Historical Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Councilman Brauer asked that the current scenic look be preserved as far as the trees and landscaping. In response, Mr. Colunga stated that the existing Canary Island Palm Trees would be incorporated into the project; grading would be minimized; and a condition of approval required preservation and maintenance of the mature trees.

Mr. Colunga went on to say that the project posed topographic challenges. He then displayed architectural renderings, including roof top terraces, a swimming pool, spa, recreation building, benches and tables. He then recommended approval and indicated the applicant and architect were present to respond to questions.

Sean Williams, 11257 San Juan, asked about parking, noting that many houses in the area didn't have garages; therefore, residents and guests parked on the street. Director of Community Development stated that the project site was reviewed for parking adequacy and it met Municipal Code requirements in that each unit had two enclosed parking spaces in addition to guest spaces and exterior parking. Mr. Colunga added that three-car garages were proposed for some of the units.

Councilman Ziprick stated that the project was near the Alquist Priollo Fault Zone and asked about nearby faults. In response, Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that the site contained no faults and a 50-foot setback from the Fault Zone was required.

No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed. In response to comments, Director of Community Development stated that the Planning Commission was very favorable toward the project, noting that the site was very visible and the project would enhance the area and perhaps be a catalyst for neighborhood improvement.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Brauer and carried to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and unanimously carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-44. Councilman Christman absent.**

#### **Resolution No. 2400**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, amending the  
Land Use Element of the adopted General Plan (GPA No. 04-04)

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda and carried to introduce Council Bill #O-2005-11 and set the Second Reading for June 28. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and carried to approve Tentative Tract Map 17209. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Petersen, seconded by Umeda and carried to approve Precise Plan of Design No. 04-09 subject to the Conditions of Approval. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Brauer and carried to introduce Council Bill #O-2005-12 on First Reading and set the Second Reading for June 28. Councilman Christman absent.**

#### **CC-2005-082 – Consent Calendar**

Councilman Brauer indicated that he opposed Tentative Tract 16730 and therefore would also oppose the Final Map.

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and carried, Councilman Christman absent, to approve the following:**

The Demands Register dated May 31, 2005 with commercial demands totaling \$102,811.89.

The Demands Register dated June 14, 2005 with commercial demands totaling \$1,547,239.68 and payroll demands totaling \$191,319.49.

The Minutes of April 26, May 3, 10 and 17, 2005 as presented.

The May 2005 Treasurer's Report for filing.

The Agreement between SPRINT PCS ASSETS, LLC and the CITY relating to a ground lease for the site at the Richardson Street Well to allow subleasing the site by Sprint to Global Signal, which would assume Sprint's obligations under the Lease.

The installation of the water and sewer line in Ohio Street as complete and the recordation of a Notice of Completion, Mladen Grbavac construction, contractor.

Council Bill #R-2005-45, with Councilman Brauer's opposition noted.

**Resolution No. 2401**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, approving the Subdivision Agreement for Final Tract Map 16730 (South Side of Mission Road, west of California Street)

**Old Business**

**CC-2005-083 – 2.5 acres located in the North Central Neighborhood, adjacent to the San Timoteo Channel and accessed from Lilac and Lane Streets**

- a. Council Bill #O-2005-05 (Second Reading/Roll Call Vote) Zone Change 03-02 from R-1 Single-Family Residential to PC, Planned Community
- b. Council Bill #O-2005-06 (Second Reading/Roll Call Vote) Development Agreement between SGA Loma Linda Estates, LP and the City to assist with future affordable housing needs throughout the city

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Brauer and carried to waive reading of Council Bill #O-2005-05 in its entirety; direct the Clerk to read by title only and call the roll. Councilman Christman absent.**

The Clerk read the title and called the roll with the following results:

Ayes:	Petersen, Brauer, Ziprick, Umeda
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Christman

**Ordinance No. 635**

An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Loma Linda from Single-Family Residential (R-1) to Planned Community (PC) for that area in the North Central Neighborhood adjacent to the San Timoteo Creek Channel and accessed from the terminus of Lilac and Lane Streets (Zone Change 03-02)

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Ziprick and carried to waive reading of Council Bill #O-2005-06 in its entirety; direct the Clerk to read by title only and call the roll. Councilman Christman absent.**

The Clerk read the title and called the roll with the following results:

Ayes:	Petersen, Brauer, Ziprick, Umeda
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Christman

**Ordinance No. 636**

An ordinance of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda approving and adopting the Development Agreement between SGA Loma Linda Estates, L.P. and the City of Loma Linda

**New Business**

**CC-2005-084 – Joint meeting of the City Council and Redevelopment Agency relating to the 2005-2006 fiscal year budget**

- a. Council Bill #R-2005-39 – Approving a loan to the Agency
- b. Council Bill #R-2005-40 – Approving the 2005-2006 adjusted appropriations limit
- c. Schedule “A” for Law Enforcement
- d. COPS Grant Expenditure Plan
- e. Investment Policy
- f. Agreement between the City and the City of San Bernardino for animal control services
- g. Council Bill #R-2005-41 – Adopting animal license fees
- h. CRA Bill #R-2005-12 – Approving a loan to the City from bond proceeds for the Loma Linda Connected Community Program
- i. Council Bill #R-2005-42 – Accepting a loan from the Redevelopment Agency for the Loma Linda Connected Community Program
- j. Revisions to fiscal year 2005/2005 ending balances and additions to the 2005/2006 fiscal year budget
- k. Council Bill #R-2005-43 – Adopting the 2005-2006 fiscal year budget
- l. CRA Bill #R-2005-11 – Accepting a loan from the City
- m. CRA Bill #R-2005-13 – Adopting the 2005-2006 fiscal year budget

The Redevelopment Agency reconvened at 8:45 p.m. with all members present except Board Member Christman. Mayor Petersen chaired the item.

City Manager Halloway introduced the item, stating that the preliminary budgets were presented during a workshop on May 24. He brought attention to the discussion relating to the purchase of fire apparatus. He also asked the City Council to set aside \$50,000 from reserves, which would not affect the allocated reserves, to possibly fund a part-time director for the Senior Center. He noted that there was \$1.8 million of unallocated reserves.

Mayor Petersen noted that the budget contained an allocation to purchase an engine in fiscal year 2005-2006, with a suggestion that a truck be purchased in fiscal year 2006-2007. He also stated that during the discussion concerning replacing the ladder truck, suggestion was made to purchase both pieces of equipment during fiscal year 2005-2006.

Chief Norris distributed an outline of the truck and engine company functions as well as proposals for Pierce and Smeal fire apparatus. Battalion Chief Roddy elaborated on the various functions of the equipment, stating that the engine and ladder truck worked in unison on an incident, having similar tasks but different functions in the goal of saving lives and extinguishing fire. He then reviewed functions of the engine company, truck company, and squad company, noting that the basic function of a truck company was to provide ground ladder support, and although the focus had been on the aerial ladder, the truck provided tools in addition to what could be provided by the engine company for forcible entry and support tools. He elaborated that the current HME engine had 80,000 miles and many hours on it, and the large engine was not able to access some areas in the city easily. He suggested that an engine with a smaller wheelbase or increase in turning radius was needed to access the areas and that the HME be moved to reserve status. A truck was needed because the current truck was a 1986 aerial ladder truck with platform that had numerous problems with hydraulics and which had been out of service several times during the last two years. The truck was included in initial alarms because of the call volume. It was advantageous for the city to have a truck because of the ISO rating.

Chief Norris and City Manager Halloway responded to questions. Extensive discussion ensued relating to purchase versus lease; two-engine versus one engine and one truck; purchasing both pieces of equipment versus purchasing one each fiscal year; cost savings if both were purchased; equipment replacement schedule.

Councilman Brauer requested that consideration be given to increasing the stipend for the Planning Commission and suggested it be increased to \$100 per meeting. Discussion ensued.



**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-39. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Resolution No. 2402**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, California, authorizing a loan to the Loma Linda Redevelopment Agency in the sum of \$1,968,000.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Brauer and carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-40. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Resolution No. 2403**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, California adopting an Amended City Appropriations Limit for fiscal year 2005-2006 in accordance with the provisions of Division 9 of Title 1 of the California Government Code

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Ziprick and carried to approve Schedule "A" for Law Enforcement. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Ziprick and carried to approve the COPS Grant Expenditure Plan. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and carried to approve the Investment Policy. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda and carried to approve the Agreement between the City and the City of San Bernardino for animal control services. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Ziprick and carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-41. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Resolution No. 2404**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, establishing animal license and impound fees and repealing Resolution No. 1082

**Motion by Petersen, seconded by Brauer and carried to adopt CRA Bill #R-2005-12. Board Member Christman absent.**

**Resolution No. 247**

A Resolution of the Loma Linda Redevelopment Agency authorizing a loan to the City of Loma Linda Connected Communities Program in the sum of \$3,278,300

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Brauer and carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-42. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Resolution No. 2405**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda authorizing acceptance of a loan from the Loma Linda Redevelopment Agency in the Amount of \$3,278,300

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and carried to approve the revisions to fiscal year 2004-2005 ending balances and additions to the 2005-2006 fiscal year budget. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Brauer and carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2005-43 as amended to include the purchase of an engine and truck for the Fire Department; \$100 per meeting for up to two meetings for Planning Commissioner; and \$50,000 toward a part-time director for the Senior Center. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Resolution No. 2406**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, California, adopting the Final Budget for the City of Loma Linda for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2005 and ending June 30, 2006

**Motion by Petersen, seconded by Brauer and carried to adopt CRA Bill #R-2005-11. Board Member Christman absent.**

**Resolution No. 248**

A Resolution of the Loma Linda Redevelopment Agency authorizing acceptance of a loan from the City of Loma Linda in the amount of \$1,968,000

**Motion by Petersen, seconded by Umeda and carried to adopt CRA Bill #R-2005-13. Board Member Christman absent.**

**Resolution No. 249**

A Resolution of the Loma Linda Redevelopment Agency establishing a Final Budget for fiscal year 2005-2006

The Agency Board recessed to allow completion of the City Council Agenda.

**CC-2005-085 – Accept with regret the resignation of Randy Neff from the Planning Commission effective July 1, 2005**

It was clarified that Mr. Neff declined consideration for renewal of membership on the Planning Commission.

**By common consent, Mr. Neff's decision was accepted with regret.**

**CC-2005-086 – Appointments to the following Committees/Commissions/Boards**

- a. Budget Committee
- b. Historical Commission
- c. Personnel Board
- d. Parks, Recreation, Beautification Committee
- e. Planning Commission (Continue to June 28, pending receipt of applications)
- f. Senior Center Board
- g. Traffic Advisory Committee
- h. Trails Development Committee

The City Council reviewed information relating to each Committee, Commission, and Board. Relating to the Budget Committee, it was noted that Jonathan Daly had not attended any meetings relating to the 2005-2006 fiscal year budget. It was recommended that the City Council either declare a vacancy and direct the Clerk to post a Special Vacancy Notice or reduce the membership to seven.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Brauer and carried to reduce Budget Committee membership to seven. Councilman Christman absent.**

The report relating to the Historical Commission was presented for information only. No action was required.

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Ziprick and carried to re-appoint Verne Miller to the Personnel Board for a two-year term to expire June 30, 2007. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Ziprick and carried to re-appoint George Pendered and Richard Wiley to the Parks, Recreation, Beautification Committee for three-year terms to expire June 30, 2008.**

**By common consent, appointments to the Planning Commission were continued to June 28, pending receipt of applications.**

Regarding the Senior Center Board, it was noted that Willard Stewart attended only one meeting during the year, Dr. Peter Struts had moved from the area, and Mr. Forrest Cathey's attendance was sparse due to health issues. It was suggested that Senior Center Board appointment of Valerie Husbands be transferred to a City Council appointment, thus leaving two Council appointments and two Board appointments vacant.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Brauer and carried to re-appoint Dr. Reinhold Trupp and Valerie Husbands to three-year terms expiring June 30, 2008. designating the appointment of Mrs. Husbands as a City Council appointment; declare four vacancies including the positions of Willard Stewart, Forrest Cathey and Peter Struts, and direct the Clerk to post a Special Vacancy Notice. Councilman Christman absent.**

**Motion by Brauer seconded by Ziprick and carried to reappoint Robert Loder and appoint Michael Stewart to the Traffic Advisory for four-year terms to expire June 30, 2009. Councilman Christman absent.**

Membership of the Trails Development Committee was discussed next, taking into consideration meeting attendance and compromising the tasks of the Committee due to absenteeism.

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda to re-appoint Lillian Miller, Rudy Szutz, and Jonathan Zirkle to three-year terms to expire June 30, 2008; declare the positions of Geri Farris, James Perry, Rick Revel, and Jan Zumwalt vacant, and direct the Clerk to post a Special Vacancy Notice.**

There were not reports of Councilmen, Commissions/Committees, or Officers.

The meeting adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Approved at the meeting of

---

City Clerk

City of Loma Linda  
City Council Minutes

PENDING CITY  
COUNCIL APPROVAL

Regular Meeting of June 28, 2005

A regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor Petersen at 7:07 p.m., Tuesday, June 28, 2005, in the City Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:	Mayor Floyd Petersen Mayor pro tempore Stan Brauer (Left at 8:23 p.m.) Robert H. Christman Robert Ziprick Charles Umeda
Councilman Absent:	None
Others Present:	City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

Councilman Christman led the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. No items were added or deleted and no public participation comments were offered upon invitation of the Mayor.

Mayor Petersen acknowledged James Hettrick, Acting City Manager while City Manager Dennis Halloway was on vacation.

**CC-2005-087 – Conflict of Interest**

Mayor pro tempore Brauer, based on the City Attorney's advise, declared a potential conflict of interest relating to the Land Use Element of the General Plan Update as it related to the South Hills because of his personal residence and other property that may be related to the South Hills.

Councilman Ziprick commented that as long as the area of Hulda Crooks Park was not discussed, he would not have a conflict of interest; if it is discussed, he would declare a possible conflict of interest and refrain from the discussion due to the location of his residence.

Mayor Petersen indicated that all items would be considered prior to the public hearing relating to the Land Use Element of the General Plan Update so that Mayor pro tempore Brauer could participate.

**CC-2005-088 – Consent Calendar**

Director of Public Works Thaipejr responded to questions relating to the Landscape Maintenance District contract, stating that maintenance of the Civic Center grounds and the Barton Road Median was not satisfactory and therefore that portion of the contract would be advertised for bids.

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to approve the following:**

The Demands Register dated June 28, 2005 with commercial demands totaling \$850,143.93 and payroll demands totaling \$192,190.08.

The May 2005 Public Safety Stats Report for filing.

Award of contract for the installation of a waterline on Orange Grove and Academy Streets to B. R. Day Construction, Inc., Covina for \$105,554 and for construction inspection and materials testing to Cal West Consultants in an amount not to exceed \$20,405.

Council Bill #R-2005-47.

**Resolution No. 2408**

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, approving the Subdivision Agreement for Final Tract Map 16650 (south side of George Street, east of Bryn Mawr Avenue)

The relocation of the Bailey Bridges over the San Timoteo Creek at Ohio Street and Mission Lane as complete and recordation of a Notice of Completion, Bonadiman McCain, contractor.

Extending of the term of contracts for fiscal year 2005-2006 as follows:

- a. Clean Street for Street Sweeping Services.
- b. Grace Building Maintenance for janitorial services for the Civic Center, Fire Station, Corporation Yard and Senior Center Buildings.
- c. Republic Electric for traffic signal maintenance and repair.

- d. Jose A. Valdes for meter reading service.
- e. Golden West Landscape for landscape services for Landscape Maintenance District No. 1 (Contract B) and a month-to-month agreement for maintenance of the Civic Center, Barton Road Median, and Loma Linda Easement Trail (Contract A).
- f. Albert Grover & Associates for monitoring traffic signals along Anderson Street and Barton Road.

Amendment to the agreement for City Attorney legal services.

Addendum to the Professional Services Agreement with Lilburn Corporation for Planning/Environmental Consultant Staff Services.

**Old Business**

**CC-2005-089 – 1.46 acres between the southern end of San Juan Drive and San Mateo Drive, north of Barton Road**

- a. Council Bill #O-2005-11 (Second Reading/Roll call Vote) – Zone Change 04-04, Amending the Zoning Map from R-2 (Duplex) to Planned Community (PC)
- b. Council Bill #O-2005-12 (Second Reading/Roll Call Vote) – Approving a Development Agreement between Elizabeth Iskander and the City to assist with future affordable housing needs throughout the city

**Motion by Christman, seconded by Umeda and unanimously carried to waive reading of Council Bill #O-2005-11 in its entirety; direct the Clerk to read by title only and call the roll.**

The Clerk read the title and called the roll with the following results:

Ayes:	Petersen, Brauer, Christman, Ziprick, Umeda
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	None

**Ordinance No. 637**

An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Loma Linda from R-2 (Duplex) to Planned Community (PC) for that area between the southern end of San Juan Drive and San Mateo Drive, north of Barton Road and consisting of approximately 1.46 acres (Zone Change No. 04-04)

**Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to waive reading of Council Bill #O-2005-12 in its entirety; direct the Clerk to read by title only and call the roll.**

The Clerk read the title and called the roll with the following results:

Ayes:	Petersen, Brauer, Christman, Ziprick, Umeda
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	None

**Ordinance No. 638**

An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda approving and adopting the Development Agreement between Elizabeth Iskander and the City of Loma Linda

**CC-2005-090 – Appointment of Planning Commissioners (Continued from June 14)**

Mayor Petersen stated that six applications had been received for two positions on the Planning Commission. Applicants were: David D. Werner, Frank Povero, Laurentiu Popescu, Kenneth E. Hunt, Don Hamer, and David C. Varnam. It was suggested that opportunity be given for the applicants to address the City Council, understanding that not all applicants were present. Also, Michael Christianson had requested that consideration be given to extending his term on the Planning Commission.

Mayor Petersen asked each applicant present to comment. Comments were offered by Michael Christianson, Laurentiu Popescu, Kenneth E. Hunt, Don Hamer, and David C. Varnam. Each applicant also responded to questions of Council Members.

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda and unanimously carried to re-appoint Michael Christianson to the Planning Commission for a three-year term to expire June 30, 2008.**

It was noted that vacancies on the Planning Commission consisted of one, one-year term to complete the term of Charles Umeda who was appointed to the City Council and one, three-year term to fill the vacancy occurring when Randy Neff declined to be considered for another term.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Ziprick and carried to appoint Frank Povero to the Planning Commission for a one-year term to expire June 30, 2006. Councilmen Brauer and Christman opposed.**

Motion by Brauer to appoint Don Hamer for a three-year term. Motion died for lack of a second.

**Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda and carried to appoint David D. Werner to the Planning Commission for a three-year term to expire June 30, 2008. Councilman Christman opposed.**

Suggestion was made to expand the Planning Commission to seven members. The Clerk was directed to place the item on the next agenda for discussion.

**CC-2005-091 – Schedule meeting regarding FEIR and Specific Plans for University Village and Orchard Park Projects**

Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that the applicants for the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans requested that the Draft Final EIR for both projects be discussed on July 26 and that on August 16, a special meeting for the projects as well as the special planning areas be held so that the issues could be discussed at one time and if necessary, discussion could continue to the meeting of August 23.

She then expressed concern about discussing the FEIR because the land used for the projects had not been determined. She responded to concerns by stating that in 2001, the City Council determined that a joint EIR was necessary in order to evaluate the cumulative impact of both projects to that portion of the City, and suggested that because all five Council Members would not be present on July 26, that a meeting be held on August 16 to evaluate both projects as well as that portion of the Land Use Element that related to that area.

City Attorney Holdaway stated that the City would be participating in a new bond issue for the Medical Center, which may also be scheduled for August 16 as well.

**Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and unanimously carried to schedule the item for July 26, with the understanding that it would be continued to 6:00 p.m., August 16; and that the special planning areas relating to that portion of the City also be scheduled for discussion at that time.**

The City Council recessed at 8:23 p.m. to allow completion of the Redevelopment Agency Agenda, and reconvened at 8:42 p.m. with all members present except Mayor pro tempore Brauer.

**Scheduled and Related Items**

**CC-2005-092 – Public Hearing/Workshop – Land Use Element of the General Plan Update, including the South Hills and excluding the Special Planning Areas**

The public hearing was opened. In response to questions concerning land use and circulation, Lloyd Zola of HDR, Inc., sub-consultant to LSA Associates for the General Plan Update project stated that there was a relationship between land use and circulation; the intent was to request the City Council to make a preliminary determination regarding land use (since there has been extensive discussion relating to land use and reduction of densities); so the Circulation Element could then be reviewed. All of the General Plan Elements would then be reviewed for consistency with each other and a final General Plan would be presented for adoption.

Councilman Christman remarked that what was being considered was a General Plan and that discussion of specific projects had complicated the General Plan process. Density range did not assure the granting of the highest number of units in the density range for development.

Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that three public hearings had been held relating to the Land Use Element; a June 1 draft of the Hillside Conservation designation differed from the April version of the Land Use Element. She stated that four letters had been received that were included in the Staff Report: Douglas Welebir, June 6; Chris Taylor of Empire Homes, June 6; Lisa Belenky, Center for Biological Diversity, June 6; Kevin Varner of Mission Development Company, June 21. She stated that a written response would be provided to the letter from Lisa Belenky within the near future when the Environmental Impact Report was discussed. Two letters were received this date: a follow up letter from Lisa Belenky, Center for Biological Diversity that served as a cover letter for a letter from the San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society and from Leroy Hansberger, HE & La Cresta giving an opinion position for his property.

Mr. Zola stated that all of the letters were received subsequent to the close of the public review period for the Draft EIR; responses will be provided in writing that will be submitted to the City Council at the time of review of the Final EIR. The basic issue is that the EIR will require review in relation to a number of changes that the City Council is contemplating in the General Plan in terms of land use. When the public hearing is conducted on the EIR, an analysis of the changes and their relationship to the environmental impact will be provided, which also address impacts on traffic and how it would change based upon the land uses.

Mr. Zola elaborated that at the last hearing, City Council requested that the density transfer provisions be simplified and to specify a maximum build out for the hillside area. He recommended modifying the text that followed the Land Use Table that referred to a density bonus for transferring density out of the land targeted for acquisition in exchange for dedication of land to the City. He suggested that density be transferred at a ratio of one dwelling unit (or whatever would be permitted in a cluster development) to the developed areas. Within the area designated Hillside Conservation, at the densities recommended by the Planning Commission, build out would be at 775 units; the area along the bench at the eastern portion of the hillside would have a maximum density of approximately 410 units for a total build out of approximately 1185 units for the entire hillside and bench areas. There was discussion concerning including an area at the western edge of the City in the hillside designation, noting that the 1185 units did not include that parcel. Density transfer provisions would be incorporated into the General Plan related to the ability to transfer density out of the bench area behind the major ridge.

He stated that the General Plan stated specifically that achievement of the maximum residential build out was not guaranteed; that criteria was established to determine the actual yield consistent with the General Plan Policies; and that final density would be based upon site specific physical characteristics, the need for mitigating or avoiding impact to biological habitats, the actual environmental sensitivity of the proposed site design, grading, types of construction, on and off-site access, and the ability to avoid impacts to other property.

Director of Community Development Woldruff asked that the City Council review and approve in concept the Land Use Element with the exception of the Special Planning Areas and that the Special Planning Areas be continued to August 16. Decision also was required for areas outside of the Hillside and Special Planning areas.

In response to questions, Mr. Zola stated that CEQA did not require response to letters received after the close of the comment period; the caveat was that letters received by other cities subsequent to a public review period that have raised substantive issues and the public agency did not respond have resulted in the EIR being overturned. He recommended that response be made to all letters received.

Mayor Petersen asked that those offering testimony limit their comments to five minutes so that everyone had an opportunity to speak within a reasonable time period.

Douglas Welebir, 1780 Sixth Avenue, Redlands; referred to his letter and stated further that a General Plan should give certainty to developers and the City as implementation of the General Plan proceeded. He elaborated that he owned 49 acres at the west end of the City that had been excluded from the Hillside designation. He also stated that his intention in selling his property was to have low density to provide estate lots. He also owned Sierra Vista Avenue and expressed a willingness to donate it to the City to provide access in addition to Oakwood Drive. He expressed a desire for the hillsides to be developed in a conservative but progressive manner and stated that the hills were private property owned by individuals.

Kevin Varner, Mission Development, 25814 Business Center Drive, encouraged the City Council to approve a General Plan that was flexible. He stated that the mission of Mission Development Company was to create a legacy that preserved and enhanced natural beauty, created beautiful balanced communities, and had local character. He supported limited development in the hills, preservation of vast open space, a density bonus formula that encouraged clustering outside of the Initiative and Targeted Open Space Areas. Relating to property owned by Mission Development Company of approximately 1,100 acres, Mission Development Company proposed to retain as much open space as possible, preserve major ridgelines, restrict homes on north facing slopes visible to the city, provide trails/trail heads, including access to existing trails, provide limited high-end development with a master amenity such as a golf course, disperse traffic and limit their access, no direct access to San Timoteo. He stated that a proposal could include 500 homes in a golf course community or other type of master amenity; 600 acres of natural open space

dedicated in perpetuity to the City or designated conservancy; trail connections, enhanced trails, parks, golf course would contribute 100 to 200 + acres of open space to the community. Over 80 percent of property owned by Mission Development Company would be dedicated to open space and deed restricted to prevent development. The proposal could also include 15 acres for senior housing near the golf course or community center. The remaining property would accommodate minimum lot sizes of 10,000 square feet with a diversity of lot sizes. The property on the bench would provide 150-175 home sites.

W. W. Morningstar, 26007 Beaumont Avenue, waived his opportunity to speak.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, distributed a map and stated that Mr. Welebir's comments were well taken, but the physical nature of the property did not change in that it had some of the highest, steepest, and most unstable land; proposed density was irresponsible; it appeared that Mr. Welebir was receiving preferential treatment over other land owners. In his opinion it was inappropriate to treat Mr. Welebir's land as anything other than a hill.

Relating to the General Plan, he stated that the starting densities were too high and the clustering incentives were too low. The map he distributed showed where clustering should be located, the primary ridgelines, where targeted open space should be. He expressed pleasure with Mission Development Company and the progress made. Mission Development Company and Leroy Hansberger appeared to be in agreement that open space areas should be subject to stringent environmental protections. He suggested that the General Plan lacked specific language relating to clustering and incentives; grading and infrastructure, from an economic standpoint, needed to be in place for the open space and from an ecological standpoint, to prevent mass grading in the open space areas.

He felt that the City should try to achieve something similar to Santa Paula in Ventura County in that Santa Paula was a core city surrounded by open space, hills, and citrus. He asked that ecologic concerns be reviewed and that the General Plan provide settled expectations to the developers, noting that clustering areas, ecological areas, etc. should have their own development standards.

Mr. Zola stated that the map showing targeted open space was in reference to the Trails Committee recommendation for the targeted open space. He noted that the next step in the process was to design development to fit the hillside, given agreed upon densities. The City could also follow up with a development code that provided specificity for certain areas, possibly creating a specific plan for the South Hills in consultation with developers and landowners.

Extensive discussion ensued between Mr. Zirkle and members of the City Council.

In response to comments, Mr. Zola stated that the map distributed by Mr. Zirkle and the maps previously provided by landowners in the area in terms of where development should occur and where open space should be designated, were strikingly similar. He also noted that there were possibly ownerships that were completely within the open space areas that would be left with no development right should Mr. Zirkle's map be included in the General Plan. The concept of follow up with a specific plan as a mechanism to negotiate transfers of density, creation of open space, and limiting development to certain areas would be a sensible process. The Policy recommended by the Planning Commission to the City Council regarding the north face of the slope was that no development be allowed on the north face unless there was ownership that was solely on the north face and development was necessary to avoid a taking of property. The specific plan process, a density transfer ordinance as part of the specific plan, and arriving at agreements between owners on transfers of density would solve the problem of having ownership that would be 100 percent open space with no use. Restrictions on dedicated open space would be appropriate.

Discussion again ensued between Mr. Zirkle and members of the City Council. Mr. Zirkle commented that the text relating to the hillside had not had Planning Commission review; developers and the conservation society had issues with the text. The text he proposed was similar to that presented by LSA Associates and suggested continuance of the item to allow collaboration and perhaps agreement on the text.

Mr. Zola recommended that direction be given to identify a situation in the hillside essentially based upon the densities recommended by the Planning Commission; that a stronger incentive package to create development clusters to the east side of the hillside area consistent with the maps provided by the landowners and Mr. Zirkle; to strengthen the language not only to the clustering, but to provide protection for the remaining open space and to ensure that properties that were within the targeted open space area would have some level of development rights so as not to create a taking. As part of the process, LSA would work with the landowners and conservation society for the purpose of submitting final language to the City Council.

Councilman Christman responded to Mr. Zirkle's comments and questioned Mr. Zirkle's authority to negotiate, noting that because of the delays in considering this portion of the General Plan, ample time was provided to negotiate; threats of an initiative had been voiced. He added that a General Plan provided general guidelines and did not contain details relating to slopes, trails, or fault lines in that such detail was provided in implementing documents.



Mr. Zirkle countered that rather than an initiative, it would benefit all concerned to arrive at an agreement, and he was willing to work toward that end.

Mr. Zola restated that in terms of Mr. Zirkle's presentation, the discussion at the Council level, information provided by Mission Development Company and Mr. Hansberger, the general direction was approximately the same; that is to take the Planning Commission's build out intensity, build a better incentive program that would direct development into three clusters and arrive at stronger protections for what would ultimately be the open space, and to accomplish it in a manner that would protect the property and development rights of properties that were within the intended open space area. If that were to be the direction of the City Council, general agreement could be achieved and a Land Use Element could be submitted. Subsequently, traffic issues could be reviewed.

[Mayor Petersen left briefly and Councilman Christman assumed the Chair]

Leroy Hansberger supported compromise and asked what numbers were being used for total build out of the South Hills.

[Mayor Petersen returned]

Mr. Hansberger commented that the issues related to the number of units ultimately approved for the South Hills, thus allowing progress towards resolution of the issues.

Mr. Zola responded that the Planning Commission recommended that density be applied to the hillside area as well as the bench area on the east side of the hillside area, which would yield a build out of 1185 units as follows: 410 units on the bench area; 775 to the south, excluding the Welebir property. The suggestion this evening was that utilizing 1185 units, an incentive program be drafted so that layout of development could occur. The recommendation of the Planning Commission was consistent with the recommendation of the landowners. It was his opinion that density was not an issue, but rather that the clusters be placed appropriately and that there was sufficient incentive for the development of those clusters to protect the open space; further, that the ultimate development yield was consistent with the Planning Commission's recommendation and the desires of the major landowners.

Mr. Hansberger disagreed with the number of units at 775, suggesting that further discussion was needed and if that number could vary, perhaps agreement could be reached.

Mr. Zola indicated that the number of 1185 units may remain the same; however because of density transfers, the location of units making up that number may vary. Density in the hillside area off of the bench was recommended at 1 unit per 5 acres within non-clustered subdivisions and 1 unit per 2 acres within clustered subdivisions. The landowners at the time did not object to that density. When that density was calculated over the land not owned by the City, it came to 775. The concept is that within the area that constitutes both the hillside and the bench, there would be a total of 1185 units; densities would be transferred off the bench because the owner of that area is contemplating 150 to 175 units. He also referred to a map provided by the landowners on June 7 that showed a cluster of 400 homes to the western area south of the primary ridgeline; 500 homes to the eastern area south of the primary ridgeline; 80 homes at the southwest corner and 55 homes in the southeast corner at Pilgrim Lane; 150 to 175 homes in the bench area, which totaled 1185 units that equated to the Planning Commission's recommendation, even though distribution may vary.

Councilman Umeda remarked that the developers and the conservancy voiced their opinions on numerous occasions; however, the City Council had not discussed the goals of the City as they related to the South Hills.

Douglas Welebir, in response to a question concerning open space and his property, stated that his property was one of the lowest and most stable because 50 years ago Caltrans chose his property as a resource for soil to build the Guthrie Interchange and compacted the hills at that time. The property was steep because it was a quarry; therefore, there was nothing natural about his property. He stated that Mr. Zirkle was not a geologist or engineer, and his statements concerning the Welebir property had no basis in truth or in fact. In his opinion, a General Plan should be consistent with the general motivation of this City and what was best for the City, generally. It should provide large lots, good living environment and alternatives for those who want other than small units. It was also his opinion that a lot of things could be done with the South Hills that would be consistent with the Hillside Initiative, the goals of this Council, and good planning that would increase the tax base and usability of the land.

Mr. Zola asked direction relating to the Welebir property in that the recommendation of the Planning Commission was that it be designated "Low Density Residential." Mr. Zirkle's request was that it be designated as part of the South Hills area and part of the hillside conservation. The Very Low Density designation was two units per acre. He stated that the City's vision of the area was outlined in the Draft Land Use Element on Page 2-8, which provided two components: maximizing preservation of the area as natural environment and permanent public open space and second, accommodating an appropriate level of development that could be designed to minimize impacts on the natural environment, protect public health

and safety, avoid increases in city-wide utility and public services costs, assure safe access, and to present a community that would provide a move up market for the City.

Councilman Umeda asked if it would be appropriate, because of the detail that has been requested, to draft a specific plan to be adopted along with the General Plan. Mr. Zola suggested setting up the preparation of the specific plan as part of the implementation of the General Plan, which was the process that the General Plan intended to follow in that the general areas of clustering could be identified in the General Plan as well as the targeted open space area.

Mayor Petersen commented on the Welebir property, stating that it was thoroughly discussed through the initiative process. The proponents of the Initiative excluded the Welebir property from the Initiative. Councilman Ziprick elaborated that the property had been modified and was seen as an appendage away from the core area of the hills.

Councilman Umeda asked the City Council to affirm the Planning Commission's recommendation, which was "Low Residential." Councilman Ziprick supported the request. Councilman Christman supported the recommendations of the Planning Commission for the South Hills area.

Doug Goodman of Goodman & Associates, a civil engineering member of the Mission Development Company Team, stated that it was his understanding that because densities had been reduced, updated studies relating to traffic were necessary. He also stated that Mission Development Company provided an exhibit of suggested conceptual points of access for projects on the east side that may be useful in that endeavor.

No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed.

Director of Community Development Woldruff stated that the Traffic and Circulation Elements of the General Plan were yet to be reviewed as well as the EIR, and the Special Planning Areas. The Special Planning Areas were to be continued to August 16, per the discussion this evening. Determination regarding densities for the entire Land Use Plan needed to be made before traffic could be analyzed.

#### **Reports of Officers**

Division Chief Crawford reminded Loma Linda residents that fireworks were prohibited in Loma Linda and encouraged residents to attend displays in surrounding cities or view them from Hulda Crooks Park. Personnel were assigned for traffic control.

The meeting adjourned at 10:44 p.m.

Approved at the meeting of

---

City Clerk